

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL TENDENCIES IN SWEDEN

C. G. CARLFELT

INTRODUCTION

Sweden today occupies a rather unique position among the nations of the world. Not only was this country spared the ravages of the last world war, but to no small degree it profited materially from that war and has since that time enjoyed a period of comparative prosperity. This has naturally been reflected in many ways in the life of the Swedish people. One result of this, as we know, has been the progress of social legislation, even to such an extent that today this country is looked on as a pioneer in this field of endeavor. Constant change and continued progress has been the most characteristic note in Swedish life during the last few decades. Swedish theology and ecclesiastical life have been no exception to this rule. These too have shared in the experience of both prosperity and change, and thus we find that in this respect also Sweden of today is not the same as it was, let us say, twenty-five years ago.

Some years ago, in speaking of Swedish theology, we stated that there was then no such a thing as a unique and native theology in Sweden but that the theologians of that country were influenced by and relied to a great extent on the theology of Germany. We did add, however, that there were signs indicating that a new day was coming, and that ere long we would perhaps be able to speak of a distinctive Swedish theology. We now believe that we can say with all truthfulness that that day has arrived and that there is something distinctive to be found in the theology now promulgated in Sweden. Of these more modern theological tendencies we are now to speak, but by way of historic orientation we deem it advisable first of all briefly to note the background and to describe the milieu out of which this theology has come.

I. THE BACKGROUND

As stated, Swedish theology at the beginning of this century shared in the main the outlook and experiences of continental theology. At that time theologians, in approaching their subject, started out from other premises and worked along other lines than is now the case. Discussions then were wont to center around such questions as the historicity of Christianity, the meaning of human personality, and the ethical implications of religion.

At the turn of the century historical criticism was making greater progress than ever before. The documents of the New Testament were literally dissected, and no effort was spared in order to ascertain the origin, authorship, and historical situation of these writings. Certainly a great deal of good was hereby accomplished, and many facts, hitherto unnoticed, were brought to light as a result of these investigations. As a corollary to this fact, however, we also find that some of the more vital factors in connection with religion were put aside as less relevant. Instead of what Jesus meant to faith, men sought to establish what the religion of the "historical Jesus" had been, and the cry was that we must go back to this religion of Jesus rather than to stop at any later formulations of theology, no matter by whom these had been made. "Back to Christ" was the slogan, and all doctrine, whether that of Christology or any other subject, was considered to be a deterioration of the pure religion of Jesus.

It is not our purpose in this connection to submit this kind of approach to Christianity to any evaluating criticism. Suffice it to say that for good and valid reasons this program failed in the fulfillment of its promises. Too many purely subjective factors entered in so as to make this "historical" approach less genuinely historical. It must also be noted that if we should place the "religion of Jesus" as our only norm, then all subsequent development in Christian thinking and in the formulation of dogma and doctrine must perforce be ruled out, and historicity in that case becomes the very opposite of what it originally purported to be. This method, if followed to its logical conclusions, would lead to a view of Christianity that might be described as "static," i. e., the tenets of our Christian religion would have been established once and

for all, and in these there could be neither progress nor development.

Examining the theology that was current three decades ago we find further that it was characterized by a very strong emphasis on ethical and moral questions. Christianity found itself on the defensive, it had to find some proper vindication and apology for its very existence, and in this respect ethics was called on to render an important service. In this endeavor Christianity, however, encounters a real paradox. On the one hand, theology had been reduced to a minimum, on the other hand, it seeks to show the reason for its existence by the fruits it might be able to produce. Certainly we are more than ready to admit that Christianity should and must show its fruits in an ethical and moral life, but we also know the results of this endeavor as it was carried to extremes, especially here in America, where the social implications of the gospel were all that finally remained of its content and meaning. Generally it may be said that the purely religious element of the gospel and of Christianity as a whole were minimized and in some quarters neglected altogether.

This situation has now changed completely, and Sweden was a pioneer in the movement of swinging back to a more stable foundation for religion and for theology. In the next place we will now speak briefly of a Swedish theologian who has done much to give an impetus to this change. This man occupies a much more important place as a true pioneer in the field of theology than is usually accorded him, due perhaps to the fact that his production of books is not as great as that of some others. What he has written and what he has said is, nevertheless, to be reckoned with, and he has clearly indicated the lines of thought now followed by many of the younger men. This man is Bishop Einar Billing.

Einar Billing.

Einar Billing, now bishop at Västerås, is the son of the late Bishop Gottfrid Billing. He became a "docent" at Uppsala in 1900 and was made professor in 1908. Billing is a later contemporary of Söderblom, and these men have much in common and, in the main at least, grapple with the same questions, though they approach them from different points of view.

It is not at all surprising that Billing, like all other theologians worthy of the name, drew much of his inspiration and insight into theology from Luther. In the year 1900 he published a Luther study entitled: *Luthers lära om staten*—"The Teaching of Luther Regarding the State." This publication opened the way to a fresh approach to Luther for Swedish theologians. There had been Swedish students of Luther previous to this time, Per Eklund not to be forgotten, but we might well say that Billing gave the impetus to a movement of Luther research that has continually gained momentum. For Billing himself the understanding and appreciation of Luther became somewhat of a passion, and from Luther he drew much of that which is the very center of his own theology.

Today we are accustomed to speak of a "theology of crisis," and the school of dialectic theology has built its system of doctrine with a view to this "crisis." Billing too was a "crisis theologian," and as such he antedates Barth and Brunner. In 1907 Billing published a volume under the title: *De etiska tankarna i urkristendomen*. (A new edition of this work came from the press in 1936.) In this important work, well worth intensive study by pastors and teachers, we find ample proof for the fact that the author was conscious of a deep crisis in theology, but it was a crisis different from that spoken of by the Barthians. Their idea of the crisis had come partly from their own more external circumstances of life, partly from their desire to liberate theology from the shackles of psychology and idealistic philosophy, forces which, as they claim, had to no small degree reshaped Christianity, given an idealized place and importance to man, and through its humanization of God robbed Him of His power and majesty. To counteract all this, it would now be the aim and purpose of this new theology to emphasize once more the majesty and power of God and to make man conscious of the distance between himself and God, who is the Judge of all things human, and who has spoken to man through the Word—a Word that is a message from above, placing man in a position where he must make his final choice.

Billing recognizes all this. The lifework of Jesus is depicted against the background of judgment and is performed under the stress of eschatological considerations. Billing would place Jesus,

as a messenger from God, in line with the prophets. Like them He brings from God to man a message that has its roots in the historical situation in which He lived. Yet Jesus and His message differ from the prophets and their pronouncements. Here was the Son who saw all that the Father did, for "the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all that He Himself does."

Billing centers his entire theology around the Word, but his concept of the Word is quite different from that propounded by the dialectic theologians. He sees the Word not only as a message from a God far removed from His creation—a "Deus absconditus"—but as a living reality, a Word in action, declaring the grace of God to man. Concerning this, Billing speaks as follows: "When we see that the pronouncements of Jesus constitute a 'message' in words as well as in deeds, then we also realize how full that message is of the idea of forgiveness. . . . If the forgiveness is to be something more than just another paragraph among a thousand others in a system of dogmatics, if it is to become the center of Christianity, religion in its very essence, then this concept can have no other meaning than this that we, in spite of our sin, can have God as a Helper present with us, and that we also can have the assurance of this fact." (*De etiska tankarna i urkristendomen*, p. 23.)

That Billing can well be termed a "theologian of crisis" is amply attested by his theology. For him, however, the "crisis" in theology is nothing that can be found or discerned on the surface of things. It goes to the very root of our concept of Christianity. Billing could be satisfied neither with a theology that in the spirit of orthodoxy laid greater stress on the correctness of the terms employed than on the reality of the life which these sought to express, nor with that kind of theology which, following the pattern of an idealistic philosophy, also lost sight of that which is essential in Christianity and in religion. It is one thing, however, merely to present a negative criticism of an existing condition or of a mode of thought and quite another to be able so to think through the problem involved that something positive is brought forth. Billing, nevertheless, has also set forth some positive principles, principles that recur again and again in modern Swedish theology. From the very beginning of his work as a

scholar, Billing, as stated, has been a close student of Luther, and from that course he has drawn both inspiration and insight, thereby showing the way that the new generation of Swedish theologians have followed. For these reasons we have deemed it advisable thus to deal with Billing and his theology, both to give him due recognition and the better to understand the more recent situation in Swedish theology.

II. SOME NOTABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT SWEDISH THEOLOGY

1. *Rediscovery of Luther and Research in His Theology.*

Billing's initiative has been followed by a number of men, and today every Swedish theologian, at least in the field of dogmatics and Christian ethics, has done extensive work in Luther research and has published some important Luther studies. We mention a few of these to show the variety of subjects covered in their productions. Arvid Runestam has given us two fine introductions to the Swedish translations of Luther's works, *The Bondage of the Will* and *Concerning the Liberty of a Christian*. Torsten Bohlin writes concerning *Gudstro och Kristustro hos Luther*, and Ragnar Ring has given us *Dualism hos Luther* and *Förhållandet mellan tro och gärningar inom luthersk teologi*. Bishop Ljunggren has produced a very important work entitled *Synd och skuld i Luthers teologi*. This book, by the way, has received recognition in Germany as a work of unusual merit concerning the very central idea in the theology of Luther. Many of us, I think, know of and have studied Hjalmar Holmquist's *Luther, Loyola och Calvin*. Bishop Aulén, himself a student under Billing, has dealt with Luther's idea of the Church, and Anders Nygren seeks especially to clarify Luther's ethical concepts in his works, *Filosofisk och kristen etik* and *Religiositet och kristendom*. Other and younger men are also adhering to this tradition of Luther research and are publishing works on the subject. We might mention that Martin Lindström, well known in the Augustana Synod, has made a new translation of Luther's great Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. It is not for us just now to evaluate the results of this renewed interest in the writings of Luther. Certainly it has borne fruit, and it is not too much to

say that this one factor perhaps more than any other has helped to reshape Swedish theology and to make it what it is today—"for better or worse," depending on what one considers to be the ultimate norm in Lutheran theology.

2. *"Motivforskningen."*

This is a word that we meet frequently in Swedish theological works of more recent origin. The word itself is not easy to translate, and we will not try to give its English equivalent until we have endeavored to explain the idea here dealt with. We will turn to Professor Anders Nygren as our authority on what is meant by the expression. Writing on the subject in "Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift," vol. I, 1933, p. 38f., Nygren introduced his article by asking the question: "What is the aim of systematic theology?" and he went on to show that in times past there have been two answers given, answers opposite in character and meaning. Speculative theology says that the aim of systematic theology is to "set forth the eternal religious ideas, liberated from the influence of time and history under which they exist in various historical religions." Systematic theology, if following that precept, would tend to become a metaphysical philosophy of religion.

From the churchly-positivistic group of theologians would come another answer, namely, that the only aim of dogmatics is to set forth the accepted tenets of a certain church or denomination. The method followed in the main by the adherents of this latter view would be the historical one, to summarize and present the teachings of our faith as they have come down to us throughout the ages.

Now Nygren claims that neither approach is satisfactory. The aim of any science is to *understand* the object of its research, and this speculative theology fails to do. Instead of understanding religion, it seeks to present it under the form of general and commonly accepted religious ideas. The churchly-positivistic approach fares no better. The driving and compelling interest here is not that of the genuine scientist but rather that of those who desire to dogmatize and to systematize each and every concept of faith. Speculative theology asks what ought to be *accepted* as general truths of religion, and the other group seeks to identify what

ought to be *believed* within a certain denomination, what constitutes its normative theology.

In its approach to the problem under discussion recent Swedish theology differs from both of the methods here mentioned. Nygren states that "if regarding any science it is true that it should seek to understand and to clarify its object, then the object of systematic theology can be none other than to understand and to clarify our Christian faith in its most characteristic aspects (egenart)." ("Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift," 1933, vol. I, p. 40.) In his work, "Eros and Agape," Nygren takes up this idea again and elaborates on it. The sum total of the discussion might well be expressed in the following quotation: "We must come to an understanding of what constitutes the very basic conception, the compelling power in a certain religious formulation, that which sets its stamp on the totality of the religion under discussion and makes possible that everything within it will have a specific meaning and coloring. The kind of research which aims at such a structural analysis, be it within the realm of religion or elsewhere, that we label 'motivforskning.'" (*Op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 17.) "Motivforskning," then, may be defined as a search for that which makes a certain phenomenon a complete entity within itself, that which defines its real structure and gives to it its most characteristic aspect. To the casual observer this may seem a futile endeavor as far as the Christian religion is concerned, for do we not in this field, and especially in Lutheran Dogmatics, have a system of doctrine that has once and for all been accepted as normative? While this may be so, it is, nevertheless, true that these formulations have been produced by men; they rest, to be sure, on revelation, but they do not constitute revelation. For that reason it may not be amiss that the Swedish theologians seek to determine again what in Christianity constitutes its innermost essence and characterizes it most clearly as a complete entity. At any rate this is one of the noteworthy things in present-day Swedish theology.

3. *The Agape Principle.*

Swedish theologians are not satisfied merely to search for the motif in theology; they think they have found what this really is. Nygren especially has made this clear in the work just quoted.

His thesis here is that the idea of love is that which is most characteristic of Christianity. But the concept of love needs to be further elucidated, and so he proceeds to show that this concept is capable of a twofold interpretation. The Eros principle designates man's love and search for God and his efforts to attain unto God, i. e., to be saved, but saved through his own efforts. The Agape principle, on the other hand, deals with God's love for man. It shows how God comes to man, offering him salvation and making it possible for man to be saved, not through his own efforts, but through the free gift of the grace of God. On this consideration Nygren builds his whole system of theology, and an imposing system it is. Even though we may not agree with him that everything in theology can be thus classified, we must, nevertheless, admit that he has produced a monumental work, and we marvel, not only at the amount of painstaking labor involved, but also at the complete knowledge this man possesses concerning the entire field of theology.

The Agape principle runs strong in current Swedish theology. Nygren works with the same theme in his work, *Försoningen* (Reconciliation), where he shows that divine love and nothing else is the basis of reconciliation between God and man.

Aulén holds to this selfsame idea, and it runs as a motif through his entire theology. Of the incarnation he says that "it was divine love that was incarnated in Christ." Again the love of God is looked upon as the basis for reconciliation. To those of us who have been brought up in the theology of Lutheran orthodoxy it may seem as if these men place undue emphasis on the idea of God's love and put His justice and righteousness in the background. Aulén, however, is very conscious of this fact and speaks again and again of the "tension" that exists in all theology and even within God Himself. If others can term their theology one of "crisis," we might just as properly say that the idea of "tension" is one of the most characteristic elements in the theological presentation of Aulén.

Aulén feels, and we think justly so, that it is not possible to have a theology that shall be logically perfect in all details, one in which there are no longer any problems, but where everything is explained to us in fully satisfactory and rational terms. The

deeper we endeavor to enter into the problems confronting us in the realm of theology, the more we will become conscious of the fact that there is a tension, a paradox that can not be explained away. For that reason, as Aulén puts it in the third edition of his work, *Den allmänneliga kristna tron*, "That summary of expressions of faith which theology puts forth must by necessity appear as a unity within tension."

Archbishop Eidem is also conversant with the Agape principle and uses it in his book, *Den lidande Guden* (The Suffering God), now available in English. He is aware of the tension that exists within God Himself. Certainly there is a righteous wrath in God, but that wrath is something very much higher and purer than the wrath of man. (*Op. cit.*, p. 46.) "The God who can not feel wrath can not love" (p. 48). Yet this wrath must not be construed to mean that God is a sworn enemy of man, rather the opposite is true. Man is the enemy of God, and reconciliation means that this enmity has been done away with. God is also holy and righteous, but this, according to Eidem, means much more than we are accustomed to think. The holiness of God is something that "exists on the other side of good and evil" (p. 71). His righteousness is a sublimated, an absolute righteousness, free from all human frailties and limitations (p. 76).

In this connection, however, the Christian is confronted with one of the greatest paradoxes he meets in his own religious life and in the consideration of religion in general, namely, that involved in the question of how God, "the One whose wrath is unavoidable, whose transcendental nature knows no limitations, whose holiness is absolute, can be experienced as the Merciful One, who in Himself knows no limitation to His grace and good will; experienced as the One who is closer to man than man is to himself; known as the God who loves with a love so strong that no human love is worthy of its name when compared with that divine love, a love which so completely constitutes the very essence of God that we can say of Him that He not only loves, but that He Himself is love." (*Op. cit.*, p. 82.) In giving an answer to the question involved in this paradox, Eidem points to the love of God as the only possible solution to the problem. He states that "our sin could not nullify the love of God" (p. 92).

It is God who, as our Father, loves and suffers the pangs of rejected love, suffers also at the thought of the ultimate fate of those of His children who will persist in rejecting His offer of love. Taking an analogy from the relationship of parents and children, Eidem points to the fact that when children have sinned against their parents, it is not the love of the child that leads to repentance but the love of the parent, a love that suffers and yet refuses to abandon its object. In this respect one can even say that no one suffers as much as God, and that God is more unhappy than any of His creatures—this due to the fact that His love is scorned and rejected (p. 100).

This suffering love finds its most sublime expression in that which took place on Golgotha. We quote a statement concerning which the author says that it is the principal thesis with reference to this matter: "Jesus' suffering unto death on the cross of Golgotha is also the high point in God's own suffering, and in and through this also the fount of all that which can be called 'forgiveness'" (p. 115).

For the believer this is not only a historic fact, it is also a living and ever present reality. He sees the cross just as really as any of the Jews who stood around it on the first Good Friday (p. 116). Now, when the Christian with the eye of faith sees the Suffering and Crucified One as Love 'sorrowing unto death,' he also looks into the very heart of God, a heart of sorrow and of suffering goodness. This is so, because where Christ is, there is also God; the two are one. Such as Christ was, such is God. He who has seen the Son has also seen the Father. "The Only Begotten One shows unto us the will and heart of God in a way that is possible for us mortals to grasp and in the only way in which we human beings can fathom that which is eternal" (p. 127). The Father suffers because His "giving" of the Son was not a giving that was devoid of feeling. The heart of the Father experiences the utmost sorrow and suffering in the giving of the Son. "Suffering love has here arrived at its absolute maximum" (p. 137). Carrying this thought a step further, Eidem arrives at the conclusion that "reconciliation" and "forgiveness" are one and the same thing (p. 138). If we hold that the Son was in the Father, then we can also say that the Father was in the Son, and this again makes the Father

not only the object but also in a certain sense the subject in the process of the Atonement.

Perhaps many will say that Eidem has carried the idea of the suffering God too far, that he has placed too great an emphasis on the love of God, and that his idea of the Atonement leads him very close to the teaching of partipassianism. That may be one side, but there is also another side to this matter, and it may be that this outweighs the other. There was a time when it was a rather rare thing to hear something said about the love of God from the pulpits in the State Church of Sweden, and not without some reason were the ministers accused of preaching only fire and brimstone as they were wont to thunder away concerning the wrath of God expressing itself in a severe anger over sin and sinners alike. It may also be that the Anselmic theory of the Atonement formerly was stressed just a little too much, with the result that the holiness and righteousness of God became the most prominent among His attributes, and that His love was given somewhat of a subordinate place. As an antidote for such a condition this renewed emphasis on the love of God has perhaps not been altogether amiss.

Dr. Aulén has a great deal to say concerning the subject of the Atonement, and he approaches the problem first of all from the point of view of the historian, seeking to ascertain how this doctrine has been formulated during the ages. As the result of this investigation, he shows that the concept in question has been understood in different ways during our Christian history. In reviewing the history of the Atonement, Dr. Aulén finds three distinct types which he terms, respectively, the classical, the Latin, and the subjective. The classical type of doctrine shows the Atonement as a movement of God to man. According to the Latin type, God is rather distant, and the satisfaction is paid by man, in the person of Christ, to God. In the subjective type, God is represented as still more distant, and the emphasis here is on man's movement toward God. The classical type is said to be the oldest of the three.

"The classical idea of the Atonement came into being together with Christianity itself. It is the most characteristic idea of the ancient church and the leading motif of Christianity during the

first one thousand years of its existence. The theology of the Middle Ages pushes it more and more into the background, but it lives under the surface and comes to life again with new powers in and through Martin Luther."

This thought that God Himself has in Christ effected both salvation and atonement, so Aulén declares, provides the key to all the passages of the New Testament which speak of Christ's work as vicarious, for our sake, or in our stead. The same is true with respect to all the passages that speak of the "new covenant in Christ's blood," "justification by the blood of Christ," and of Christ as "our Passover." The Pauline idea of sacrifice lies wholly within the limits of the classical concept of the Atonement. Paul uses sacrificial imagery as freely when he speaks of his own self-oblation as Christ's apostle as when he speaks of Christ's death.

When the full flood of light of scientific investigation has been focused on the patristic age, we shall find, so Aulén believes, that our common and conventional interpretation of the Christology and the doctrine of salvation of that period rests on the presuppositions of nineteenth century theology rather than on an objective and unprejudiced analysis of the actual work of the Fathers.

III. THE CHURCH

Another very important trend in modern Swedish theology is its renewed interest in and emphasis of the Church. Dr. Hjalmar Lindroth, professor of Systematic Theology at Uppsala, has made the idea of the Church the main point in his approach to theology. It was Bishop J. A. Eklund, however, who was the real pioneer in this rediscovery of the place and meaning of the Church and that not only within theology but even more so within the religious life and consciousness of the people of Sweden. He spoke and wrote concerning this "discovery," but he did what was perhaps of still greater importance, he wrote hymns on the theme of the Church, hymns that are now loved and sung by the church people of Sweden.

Others soon saw the rich potentialities that the idea of the Church contained, and soon we find the slogan: "The people of Sweden—the people of God" ("Sveriges folk — ett Guds folk"). Students at the universities were gripped by a new enthusiasm for

the Church, and as a result there was organized what was then called a crusade for the purpose of realizing that slogan. The results of this crusade are still visible both within the Church as an institution and in the religious life of the people as a whole.

SUMMARY

Even though many questions may be raised as to some of the details of modern Swedish theology, we must, nevertheless, agree that this theology has not only changed materially during the last few decades but that it has changed for the better. The extreme position held by such men as Linderholm and Wetter is no longer tenable, and their particular kind of theology is now a thing of the past. There is after all a strong positive strain in modern Swedish theology and in its presentation of doctrine it is guided by the religious principle to a greater extent than before. We might point to the fact that there are humanistic strains also to be found in this theology, but in the main it seeks to have the religious aspects clearly in mind. In this connection we must not, however, make our own idea of pietism and that of the "religious," as these men understand and use the word, synonymous terms, but this does not, on the other hand, mean that the present generation of Swedish theologians lack in personal piety, though that concept, as we know, is quite relative in its application.

One might well be surprised at the fact that the theology commonly known as Barthianism has had a comparatively small influence on Swedish theology. This is due partly to the fact that Sweden has not passed through the same crisis as Germany, where the field was ripe for a theology that expresses pessimism regarding this present world, but has all the more to say regarding that to come. The real reason for the fact that Barthianism has made no inroads in Sweden lies in the fact that Swedish theologians antedated Barth in giving expression to some of the ideas now found in his theological system. Through an intensive study of Luther, influences were received which led away from the tenets of the dialectic theology, which after all is closer to Calvin than to Luther. (Sv. Teol. Kvartalskrift, 1927, p. 325.)

In certain respects, however, these two schools of theology run parallel. Both of them react against the immanence, monism,

anthropocentricity, subjectivism, and evolutionistic tendencies of a former theology. They have also this in common, that they emphasize the sovereignty of God and the theocentricity of faith and of the entire Christian life. There is also something of the same approach to the paradox and to the "irrational" elements in religion. As to the inner structure these two schools are quite opposite in character. The dialectic theologian has his strength in his negations, whereas Swedish scholars are more positive; and this again, if we need to give a reason for it, can be explained by pointing to the fact already mentioned, that Luther more than any one else has influenced the present theology of Sweden.

There was a time when Swedish theology was apt to take its cue from, or at least to interchange ideas with, the theologians of Germany. That situation has changed of late, and now this interchange of ideas is instead conducted between the Swedes and the Anglicans. A great deal of English literature is read in Sweden, and a number of Swedish books have been translated into English. Some students from England are to be found at the universities of Sweden, and Swedish theologians and church leaders go to England for conferences and discussions. Furthermore there is pulpit and altar fellowship between the churches of England and Sweden.

By way of recapitulation, we enumerate the points that to us seem most characteristic of recent Swedish theology. These are:

1. The work of Einar Billing, indicating the lines later developed more fully.
2. Renewed interest in Luther and a constant research in his writings.
3. The "rediscovery" of the Church by J. A. Eklund and others.
4. A fresh approach to theology through the method termed "motivforskning."
5. A greater emphasis on the love of God as a factor in the Atonement.
6. The stressing of the idea of "tension" in connection with religion and theology.

